

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK



STEVE LEVY
SUFFOLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

R. Lawrence Swanson
CHAIRPERSON

James Bagg
CHIEF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYST

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Council of Environmental Quality will convene a regular public meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, August 19th, 2009 in the Arthur Kunz Library, H. Lee Dennison Building, Fourth Floor, Veterans Memorial Highway, Hauppauge, NY 11788. Pursuant to the Citizens Public Participation Act, all citizens are invited to submit testimony, either orally or in writing at the meeting. Written comments can also be submitted prior to the meeting to the attention of:

**James Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst
Council on Environmental Quality
Suffolk County Planning Department
P.O. Box 6100
Hauppauge, NY 11788**

**Council of Environmental Quality
R. Lawrence Swanson, Chairperson**

COUNTY OF SUFFOLK



STEVE LEVY
SUFFOLK COUNTY EXECUTIVE

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

R. Lawrence Swanson
CHAIRPERSON

James Bagg
CHIEF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYST

REVISED AGENDA

MEETING NOTIFICATION

Wednesday, August 19th, 2009 9:30 a.m.

Arthur Kunz Library

H. Lee Dennison Bldg. - 4th Floor

Veterans Memorial Highway, Hauppauge

Call to Order:

Minutes - check the web at

<http://www.co.suffolk.ny.us/departments/planning/minutes.aspx#ceq>

June 17th, 2009 Minutes are available on-line for review

Correspondence:

Public Portion:

Historic Trust Docket:

Director's Report:

Updates on Housing Program for Historic Trust Sites

Updates on Historic Trust Custodial Agreements

Updates on Suffolk County Parks

Project Review:

Recommended TYPE II Actions:

- A. Ratification of Recommendations for Legislative Resolutions Laid on the Table for August 4, 2009 and August 18th, 2009.
- B. Proposed Rehabilitation of Movable Bridges CP 5806 & CR 5838.

Project Review:

Recommended Unlisted Actions:

- A. Proposed Acquisition for Open Space Preservation Purposes Known as the Gail Clark - Chandler Addition Property, Town of Brookhaven.
- B. Rehabilitation of CR 11, Pulaski Road, from the vicinity of Woodbury Road to Depot Road, CP 5168, Town of Huntington.

Other Business:

CAC Concerns:

*****CAC MEMBERS:** The above information has been forwarded to your local Legislators, Supervisors and DEC personnel. Please check with them prior to the meeting to see if they have any comments or concerns regarding these projects that they would like brought to the CEQ's attention.

*****MEMBERS – PLEASE NOTIFY THIS OFFICE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE IF YOU WILL BE UNABLE TO ATTEND.**

*****ALSO FOLLOWING THE MEETING PLEASE LEAVE BEHIND ALL MATERIALS OF PROJECTS THAT YOU DO NOT WANT OR NEED AS WE CAN RECYCLE THESE MATERIALS LATER ON.**

ORIGINAL

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

COUNCIL ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
MEETING

August 19, 2009
9:30 AM

CHAIRPERSON:
R. Lawrence Swanson

Reported by: Donna Spratt
Court Reporter

RECEIVED
S.C. PLANNING DEPT.
2009 SEP - 1 PM 12: 15

1

2

2 A P P E A R A N C E S:

3

4 Michael Kaufman, Vice Chairman

5 Christina DeLisi

6 Eva Growney

7 Thomas Gulbransen

8 Richard Machtay

9 Daniel Pichney

10 Gloria Russo

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

2

3

MR. SWANSON: We'll begin our meeting. We have the minutes from May twelfth. Anybody look at the minutes from May twelfth?

7

MR. KAUFMAN: We have minutes?

8

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll have to postpone them. Please look at them for the next meeting.

10

11

There is also posted -- Jim handed me minutes of July fifteenth meeting. Next time we will deal with those.

12

13

14

Jim, there is one piece of correspondence that I will pass around that is -- we received an invitation to the Fourteenth Annual Pine Barrens Research Forum which is on October first and second at Brookhaven National Lab Bruckner Hall. I'll pass this around.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Any other correspondence you want to call our attention to, Jim?

22

23

MR. BAGG: No.

24

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Historic trust.

25

1

4

2

MR. MARTIN: Good morning. With

3

our housing program review, we just had

4

our meeting with the housing advisory

5

board this past Monday. We went over the

6

last nine housing units, as we call them,

7

to review the rent structure and we kept

8

-- actually we kept a lot of them because

9

they're -- the new appraisals are more

10

reasonable, but the houses where we

11

consider that there is outstanding

12

situations that the committee wants to

13

reduce the rents, we do so.

14

We were able to review the Isaac

15

Mills house. Hopefully, we'll be coming

16

up with a competitive rent for a County

17

employee to move in there, which will just

18

be using parts of the interior, not the

19

whole house.

20

And also the Smith Stimson house in

21

West Hills. It's been vacant now over two

22

years since the rent increases, so

23

hopefully with the rent reductions on

24

those historic buildings, we will be able

25

to occupy them this year. That is our

1

5

2

goal.

3

We're asking the park police first.

4

That is the priority on the list by

5

legislative resolution and then open up to

6

all county employees. The committee is on

7

going.

8

If we have any new acquisitions

9

that -- to bring on board, buildings that

10

would be rented for housing, the committee

11

would meet again, but as of now, we're

12

caught up.

13

MR. Kaufman: What is the rent

14

going to be on the Stimson house in West

15

Hills?

16

MR. MARTIN: Nineteen hundred

17

dollars, which is equivalent to the rent

18

that we have for the another house which

19

is a similar comparable house. That is

20

also within that park, and so for the

21

size, it has quite a few bedrooms.

22

MR. KAUFMAN: I've been inside.

23

It's a fuel hog. It is a nightmare to

24

heat.

25

MR. MARTIN: That goes into the

1

6

2

review, and also there is one request from

3

the committee that we, on these buildings

4

where it is a concern, the utilities, that

5

the Parks Department go in and do what it

6

can; some insulation, storm windows,

7

possibly replace, if it's an older

8

furnace, with a new one that's more energy

9

efficient.

10

They have put those requests to

11

Parks during this review process.

12

MR. KAUFMAN: That is an issue I

13

wanted to bring up.

14

If I may.

15

MR. SWANSON: Mm-hmm.

16

MR. KAUFMAN: Some of these

17

buildings are rather energy inefficient.

18

Stimson, for example. You can't put

19

insulation.

20

MR. MARTIN: Maybe in the attic.

21

MR. KAUFMAN: That is going to be a

22

tight squeeze up there.

23

MR. MARTIN: You can lay the

24

insulation over the floor boards, like

25

roll it down, and that's what we'll be

1

7

2

looking to do.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KAUFMAN: The question really partially comes down to the windows. I know we've tried architecturally in the past to keep windows, keep architecturally true to what has been over there and with energy costs rising and things like that, I know you guys, historic services have been looking into trying to update windows but keep triple pane, double pane them but keep them architecturally true.

MR. MARTIN: The historic window itself we would keep original in that we follow all the National Register guidelines on that. Our program does, but the storm windows we can add to that.

We can update and modernize. Looking to do it in a way you're back to your historic, not effecting the building at all. To rebuild, you would have to rebuild the historic windows to accommodate these panes.

MR. KAUFMAN: Are we going to disturb heavily the historic integrity of

1

8

2

the buildings if we were to replace at

3

least selected structures windows, the old

4

windows and not follow necessarily the

5

code?

6

MR. MARTIN: Definitely. That is

7

number one. It's pretty absolute that you

8

do not replace historic windows.

9

Like I said, you can add storm

10

windows or something, but it's a very

11

important part of the historic fabric of a

12

building.

13

MR. KAUFMAN: Given the regulations

14

to update for energy efficiency.

15

MR. PICHNEY: Storm windows are

16

wonderful; a piece of glass with a frame

17

on it. You see right through. It doesn't

18

destroy the integrity.

19

MR. MARTIN: Right, but for all

20

historic guidelines, they really stress

21

actually not to change or switch out the

22

historic windows. It really does a lot of

23

damage to the historic buildings.

24

MS. GROWNEY: I really support that

25

point of view with the windows. That is

1

9

2

very important, but I also want to just

3

put on the table -- maybe you guys have

4

already thought about this -- to consider

5

possible geothermal systems, especially if

6

you're going to have to replace some

7

burner of some sort.

8

This might seriously be worthwhile

9

because of the efficiency level of the

10

geothermal and there are -- with the way

11

the new sustainability, if you will,

12

spectrums developing, there are a lot of

13

good guidance being provided to examine

14

the buildings, and you might even be able

15

to get some funding to do so and it might

16

be really seriously worthwhile on ones

17

that need new systems in there to

18

consider.

19

MR. MARTIN: Coindre Hall has been

20

discussed. I would like to talk to you

21

further to get more information on that.

22

Within the Parks Department, that

23

is our largest historic building that has

24

been brought up that would be the

25

candidate, at least the first one, to

1

10

2

seriously take a look at a system like

3

that.

4

MR. KAUFMAN: That is a fuel hog.

5

MS. GROWNEY: This is a big step in

6

a positive direction.

7

MR. MARTIN: People have taken that

8

idea seriously.

9

MR. PICHNEY: If I just may ask how

10

does that work? Does it rely on the

11

difference between the -- sort of like the

12

constant ambient temperature in the ground

13

-- or temperature?

14

MS. GROWNEY: It's less energy

15

because instead of going from zero to 70

16

to heat, you're only going from 52 to 70.

17

You're using less energy to get the result

18

of the heating or air conditioning,

19

depending on which way --

20

MR. PICHNEY: More efficient than a

21

high efficiency gas burner?

22

MS. GROWNEY: Depends on what type

23

of building that you're working in, but

24

supposedly, yes. I personally don't know

25

enough about it.

2

I've spoken to enough people

3

involved with a new level of development

4

on this and energy experts, yes, it is.

5

I can't do that myself. I don't

6

know enough about it. It is worth at

7

least exploring on a case by case basis.

8

You have to look at the whole picture.

9

If you have an energy hog, it is

10

still a hog but you're reducing the amount

11

you're having to provide. They may have

12

other ways to deal with some of the

13

leakages. They'll make recommendations on

14

a whole picture.

15

MR. KAUFMAN: Just to let you know,

16

geothermals are supposedly one of the

17

coming waves in alternatives, if you will.

18

It is high installation costs. The

19

systems themselves are somewhat fragile.

20

They do have the advantage in that

21

they have less of a carbon footprint.

22

They generally run off electricity as

23

opposed to burning fuels, so that is may

24

be in an overall sense, may be a better

25

way in certain ways.

1

12

2

Are they as efficient as gas fired

3

things? Some of the more efficient stuff

4

that is out there where you get 95 or 96

5

percent of combustion is very, very

6

efficient and comparable in overall usage,

7

but they also have high installation

8

costs.

9

Depending on the budgetary aspects

10

and restraints, it may be a good system to

11

look at and may have lower operating

12

costs, but not necessarily. You have to

13

look at the installation costs.

14

MS. GROWNEY: Sometimes they are

15

comparable. You have to do it case by

16

case and be careful. Don't make a blanket

17

assumption because sometimes the amount it

18

is, the more expense, is miniscule

19

compared to other systems plus operating

20

costs of other systems.

21

You have to examine what the

22

buy-out period is going to be.

23

MR. PICHNEY: But the gas burners

24

have, or are more I should say,

25

maintenance free, especially if they don't

1

13

2

have electronic ignition. If they have a standard ignition, it is not crapping out in the middle of the winter.

3

4

5

MS. RUSSO: I wanted to add as far as the cost benefit analysis, a typical system for a typical residence for a homeowner is still fifty thousand dollars right now, today.

6

7

8

9

10

MS. GROWNEY: Not necessarily.

11

MS. RUSSO: I did research it months ago. I was shocked how high it is.

12

13

MS. GROWNEY: It really depends. It is not necessarily that high. It depends on who is doing it.

14

15

16

There is a lot of people that are jumping on the band wagon. You have to get people that, you know, are looking to do the right thing.

17

18

19

20

And there is also, certainly if -- I don't know, there may be funding, maybe there isn't -- if there is, that would be great. Then you could do an analysis on something.

21

22

23

24

25

You need to find people that want

1

14

2

to work with the County.

3

4

MS. RUSSO: The purchase price of installation is significantly high and see what your payback period is going to be.

5

6

7

8

MR. MARTIN: Coindre Hall does have high utility costs. People thought that would be a good place for a pilot program.

9

10

11

12

By the time we did that County speed, do that as an example and hopefully, the price goes down and we can do a lot more.

13

14

15

16

MS. GROWNEY: If you find somebody to work with who works with the County the way they need, there might be some benefit of multiple installations.

17

18

MR. SWANSON: Jim, you want to make a comment about Parks?

19

20

21

22

MR. BAGG: We invited Mr. Gibbons to this meeting. He had a pre-engagement. He will be here at the next meeting to give you an update on Parks.

23

24

25

MR. SWANSON: Ratification of type two actions, Jim, do you have anything you want to call our attention to?

1

15

2

MR. BAGG: No, it's straight

3

forward. Everything is type two or

4

previously reviewed.

5

One interesting point, there is an

6

emergency dredging project in there but

7

that is it.

8

MR. KAUFMAN: Is that Southold

9

project sixteen seventy-two?

10

MR. BAGG: Yeah. Sixteen,

11

seventeen?

12

MR. KAUFMAN: I have sixteen

13

seventy-two.

14

MR. BAGG: Basically that is a type

15

two action because it's deemed emergency,

16

done in cooperation with New York State

17

DEC.

18

MR. SWANSON: Do we have a motion?

19

MR. GULBRANSEN: Could I ask about

20

sixteen fifty-one, community development

21

and job creation? Is that a change or --

22

MR. BAGG: The existing law allows

23

use for acquisition of development rights.

24

Once we acquire property, they can strip

25

them for affordable housing, and they want

1

16

2

to change that to incorporate the other
entities.

3

4

However, that has to go to
referendum to the people.

5

6

MR. SWANSON: Okay, Tom?

7

MR. GULBRANSEN: Thank you.

8

MR. SWANSON: We have a motion to
accept staff recommendation?

9

10

MR. KAUFMAN: I make a motion to
accept.

11

12

MR. MACHTAY: I second.

13

MR. SWANSON: Any further
discussion?

14

15

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

16

All in favor?

17

(Whereupon, all members responded
in the affirmative.)

18

19

Opposed?

20

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

21

Motion carries.

22

Proposed acquisition for open
space, Chandler Estate.

23

24

Loretta.

25

MS. FISCHER: I have one acquisition

1

17

2

before you today. It's a parcel located
3 kind of within the Chandler Estate County
4 Park up in Mount Sinai. It is point seven
5 five acres, and it does have an existing
6 structure on it, or structures on it.

7

Those structures will be removed
8 prior to transfer to the County Parks
9 Department. We will be acquiring it, and
10 then the Division of Real Property
11 Acquisition and Management will be in
12 charge of the demolition.

10

11

12

13

MR. SWANSON: Was this just
14 originally a private home?

14

15

MS. Fischer: Yes.

16

MR. SWANSON: Any questions?

17

MR. KAUFMAN: I guess this was an
18 out parcel of the original purchase, and
19 it just wasn't purchased at the time?

18

19

20

MS. Fischer: Yeah, it was a
21 separate parcel. I don't think it had --
22 there was a different owner. I don't
23 think it was owned by the same entity.

21

22

23

24

That is the remaining portion of
25 the Chandler Estate.

25

1

18

2

MR. KAUFMAN: There is an in

3

filling of utility lines?

4

MS. ~~Fischer~~: Yes.

5

MR. SWANSON: Any other questions?

6

MR. PICHNEY: I'm assuming this

7

structure doesn't have any significance.

8

MR. MARTIN: I can speak to that.

9

The Commissioner did send a letter to

10

Loretta for her files that he would like

11

to have this building removed.

12

I reviewed this. It was a house,

13

maybe mid-twentieth century that was

14

placed there as part of the Chandler

15

Estate, but it didn't rise to the historic

16

significance to be a County landmark.

17

MR. SWANSON: Okay, do we have a

18

motion to accept?

19

MR. MACHTAY: Motion.

20

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

21

MR. SWANSON: Any further

22

discussion?

23

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

24

All in favor?

25

(Whereupon, all members responded

1

19

2

in the affirmative.)

3

Opposed?

4

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

5

Motion carried.

6

I have to go back. I apologize,

7

Jim, for screwing up the order of things.

8

MR. BAGG: That is all right.

9

MR. SWANSON: Rehab of movable

10

bridges. It is in your packet.

11

They're proposing to rehabilitate

12

two bridges, and one is the Quogue bridge

13

at Beach Lane and West Bay bridge. I

14

guess it is actually three bridges, and

15

then there is another bridge

16

rehabilitation of the Smith Point Bridge,

17

and this has been recommended as type two.

18

This repair --

19

MR. BAGG: If you notice, they did

20

in ninety-five pass a generic type two

21

action for review of such things, and this

22

is attached to the information you have.

23

That resolution is in there for your

24

consideration.

25

I think the same -- the same thing

1

20

2

applies here. That was a generic for
3 proposed rehabilitation of various bridges
4 and embankments.

5

MR. MACHTAY: Are these emergency
6 repairs or is this maintenance, on-going
7 maintenance?

8

MR. BAGG: On-going maintenance
9 for, you know, the movable parts of the
10 bridge to make sure that they continue to
11 work.

9

10

11

12

MR. MACHTAY: I'll make a motion
13 for a type two action.

13

14

MS. RUSSO: Second that.

15

MR. SWANSON: We have a motion and
16 a second.

16

17

Jim, I guess I have a question
18 about the process of actually doing it and
19 that is in the cleaning, painting,
20 stripping so forth. Does the County
21 routinely make sure that the ships and so
22 forth don't fall into the water?

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. BAGG: They have to adhere to
24 all State and federal regulations which
25 requires that they have to maintain that

24

25

1

21

2

material, keep it out of the water.

3

MR. SWANSON: It is disposed of as hazardous waste?

4

5

MR. BAGG: It depends if it's lead based paint or not.

6

7

MR. SWANSON: Any other comments?

8

MR. PICHNEY: This is not environmental.

9

10

Do you know if they're going to start this work in the fall so as not to create havoc?

11

12

13

MR. BAGG: I would assume DPW does a fairly good job in terms of repair planning when they do repairs and maintenance so they don't do it in the middle of rush hour. I assume they will have irate people. They will do it in the fall when traffic is not that bad.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. KAUFMAN: I had a conversation with Bob Whalen about this a couple of weeks ago. I brought up that exact issue.

21

22

23

I believe he said it won't create torture. They'll try to do it in low traffic periods, but if they had to do it

24

25

1

22

2

at other times, they would try to avoid
3 traffic impacts.

3

4

He was very aware of the issues,
5 shall we say.

5

6

MR. SWANSON: We have a motion and
7 a second.

7

8

All in favor?

9

10

(Whereupon, all members responded
in the affirmative.)

11

Opposed?

12

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

13

Abstentions?

14

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

15

Motion carries.

16

17

We have rehabilitation of County
Road 11, Pulaski Road, from Woodbury Road
18 to Depot Road. Anybody here to speak?

18

19

Identify yourself for the record.

20

21

MR. GEIGER: Richard Geiger,
21 consulting engineer for Suffolk County
22 DPW. We're here to discuss CR 11, Pulaski
23 Road, Suffolk County capital project five
24 one six eight. I believe you all have the
25 packets that were distributed.

24

25

A couple of quick discussions of what is out there now. The project is rehabilitation and improvements from Woodbury Road to Depot Road, an approximate length two point three miles. I want to note that enclosed within that two point three mile segment are the Long Island railroad tracks and New York Avenue Route 110. We will not be working within those boundaries.

The project is a what Suffolk County has been doing quite a bit of lately; converting the two lanes into a three lane road. This project we anticipate will be a single phase, duration of twelve months beginning -- we would like to begin in November of 2010 and have completion of November 2011.

This road is classified as an urban minor arterial roadway. It is typically the forty-nine and a half foot right of way, although the segment from Woodbury to Oakwood is wider. That has a right of way width of sixty-six feet.

1

2

The total area of County property within this two point three mile segment is fourteen point nine acres.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

What the County will be doing is providing pavement widening to increase traffic safety, pedestrian safety and bicycle safety. Right now what you have is a road that is basically a two lane road with an undefined shoulder, if at all.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

You have curves that are intermittent, sidewalks that are intermittent on both sides. They want to upgrade this by providing a standard three lane road, and that would be an eleven foot travel path each direction and include a ten foot sheared left turn lane.

19

20

21

22

What they also will do is provide some concrete sidewalks and curbing on both north and south sides the entire length of the project.

23

24

25

As far as -- they will also be making drainage improvements providing independent leaching pools where

1

25

2

necessary, and they will also be upgrading

3

the existing positive system which is two

4

positive systems. There is one in the

5

vicinity of Oakwood Road and there is

6

another one in the vicinity of Fifth

7

Avenue by the railroad crossing there.

8

Those are existing, and they will

9

be cleaning the existing pipe upgraded,

10

providing some additional connections as

11

necessary. What they won't be doing,

12

there will not be any major grade changes.

13

They will be putting standard

14

nominal two inch overlay over the road,

15

and there won't be any major fills or

16

cuts, won't be affecting private

17

properties, no major realignments. We

18

will be staying totally within the

19

existing forty-nine and a half feet or

20

sixty-six foot respective right of ways.

21

There will be no acquisitions.

22

Even on corners where there may be

23

a turning radius where the property line

24

encroaches, we will not be doing that.

25

Basically the sidewalks will go straight

1

26

2

to the side street, and there will not be any quadrants that would encroach over private properties.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

We do not anticipate any significant environmental impacts. We have the letters from the environmental and historic societies that there won't be any impacts.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

During construction, there will be no detours off of CR 11 into the side street areas and also we have -- there will be no major increases to the watersheds. We are going to be widening the pavement to thirty-eight feet, but we're not going to be bringing in any water that doesn't get to CR 11 now.

18

19

20

21

22

23

There will be a higher run off coefficient, which is why we would be adding independent structures and improving the existing positive system, but no new water will be introduced to the site under this project.

24

25

Also, we will not be affecting any streams or other surface waters. The

1

27

2

closest fresh water wetlands is down by

3

Route 108 which is about twenty-five

4

hundred feet from Woodbury Road. We're

5

not going to have any impact on any

6

surface waters or streams.

7

Basically the type of construction

8

will be conversion from a two lane to

9

three lane road. Right now you have the

10

typical road section consisting of two ten

11

foot wide concrete panels and asphalt

12

shoulders on each side, as I mentioned, of

13

undefined lengths in some cases.

14

What we will be doing is milling

15

the existing asphalt over the concrete

16

panels. We would want to scrape all that

17

off. The County wants to shatter the

18

existing concrete panels so you don't have

19

a rigid pavement.

20

It will be converted from rigid to

21

flexible pavement which will preclude the

22

cracks that you see in the longitudinal

23

and transverse directions after one or two

24

winters. We'll be milling off the top,

25

pulverizing the existing concrete panels,

1

2

reshaping it.

3

4

5

6

They will provide a full depth asphalt shoulder section, which will give ultimately a thirty-eight foot curb to curb pavement width.

7

8

9

10

MR. SWANSON: Question of clarification. When you said you were going to shatter the concrete, existing concrete?

11

MR. GEIGER: Pulverize it.

12

13

MR. SWANSON: Get it down to gravel size?

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. GEIGER: I believe it is maybe a three by three size. What they want to do is convert it from rigid pavement that moves independently. It gives you less cracks to a more flexible pavement. They'll shatter it, reshape it, pave over that over the entire section.

21

22

23

24

25

Ultimately what the County will be providing obviously is a better road surface, better travel for vehicles. The sheared left turn lane has a lot of benefits; getting the vehicles making a

1

29

2

left turn onto side streets or driveways

3

off travel the way which now means that

4

vehicles behind them don't have to go

5

around. They can travel straight through.

6

When they to have go around,

7

especially since there is no curb or

8

sidewalk, they encroach within the areas

9

of bicycles or pedestrians or children

10

walking to school.

11

They're providing a better road and

12

safer road for vehicles, pedestrians and

13

bicyclists, in addition to providing five

14

foot sidewalks on both sides for

15

pedestrians which doesn't exist now.

16

We feel that this is a typical

17

Suffolk County project, what they do, and

18

really we feel it has benefits in all

19

areas; environmentally, safety reasons

20

before road pavement, drainage, make the

21

area a better place.

22

MR. SWANSON: Couple of questions.

23

First, I'm glad that you're accommodating

24

bicycles. I guess one of my concerns is,

25

in fact, a three lane road. I see them as

1

30

2

hazards.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you remember in the fifties we used to have three lane highways, and they were deadly and essentially they were done away with. Now we're going back into more congested conditions and putting in three lane roads.

I'm wondering what is the accident rate for head on collisions in a -- in Suffolk County?

MR. GEIGER: I think the word three lane roads is a misnomer. It is a one lane road in each direction separated by a partial barrier and striping where there are no turns necessary.

MR. SWANSON: Sometimes those things are five hundred to a thousand feet in length.

MR. GEIGER: They would be in the area between Woodbury and Oakwood where there are no turns. There will be a partial barrier with a ten foot stripe median.

I don't know what the accident rate

1

31

2

is for that type of situation above what normally would be passing somebody else in the left lane. There would be a partial barrier. The lane is not per se a three lane road where you can use the left lane to pass somebody.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

That is not what these are designed for. There is one lane each direction and this median barrier, it is a barrier where there are no turns.

12

13

14

MR. SWANSON: The other comment I had is what is your definition of limited sight distance? How does that --

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. GEIGER: Basically based on distance velocity which is forty-five miles per hour, if you have a horizontal curve to the right or left, there is a formula and mathematical way of figuring based on safe stops, sight distance, how far can the person see as opposed to how quickly can they stop based on reaction time, braking time and site distance.

24

25

We determine that really the only area where a possible site distance would

1

32

2

have to be examined, as you come from west

3

to east, you go up from Woodbury up to

4

where it flattens out by the farm stand, a

5

little bit of a right hand turn. Possibly

6

some of the vegetation is encroaching

7

within the County right of way.

8

If that is the case, they'll trim

9

back to the right of way line. Other than

10

that, the road is basically straight and

11

there really are no horizontal or vertical

12

limited sight distances.

13

MS. GROWNEY: The speed limit will

14

not be changed?

15

MR. GEIGER: Posted speed limit is

16

subject to the Town of Huntington or

17

Suffolk County. The design speed based on

18

eighty-five percentile of our tests was

19

forty-five miles per hour. I think in

20

some of the segments of that section, I

21

think it might be thirty.

22

They can post whatever they want.

23

The road is designed for safety at

24

forty-five.

25

MR. MACHTAY: I have some questions

1

33

2

about the EAF you prepared.

3

Total contiguous acres now owned at
4 the site?

5

MR. GEIGER: Fourteen point nine.

6

MR. MACHTAY: How about two or
7 three hundred? There is County property,
8 the farms on both sides the Wicks Farm,
9 the Froehlich Farm, the wholesale nursery
10 among other lands in there. It must be a
11 good couple of hundred acres.

12

MR. GEIGER: The County owns it. I
13 don't know if that makes a difference as
14 far as this job goes. We have no intent
15 of going beyond the sixty-six feet right
16 of way.

17

MR. MACHTAY: There is a problem
18 when you talk about ponds in Nassau
19 County. To the west of there, a lot of in
20 fill on those ponds had to do with run off
21 from the farms. The sand, silt and gravel
22 that when they were farms would run off in
23 to the road and down to the ponds, so the
24 third pond is filled in.

25

I believe it was Norman Sule, the

1

34

2

director at the fish hatchery brought some trout into us at one point with gills all loaded with sand or silt that had run off from the farms.

3

4

5

6

I don't think that happens anymore because it is now all grown in with weeds. The other thing you should know, Oakwood Road right now is being paved. That is being paved.

7

8

9

10

11

MR. GEIGER: Is that a mill and fill type project?

12

13

MR. MACHTAY: They have milled it. They're going to cover it. You know, the other thing I was going to say was, for what it's worth, there is said to be a pond on the Froehlich Farm.

14

15

16

17

18

The reason I say that to bring that to your attention, I was sued over that personally, and the Town was sued.

19

20

21

MR. GEIGER: That is the north or south side?

22

23

MR. MACHTAY: On both sides.

24

25

MR. GEIGER: The pond's on which side?

1

35

2

MR. MACHTAY: Actual drainage

3

system is from the farms to go into the

4

road and down, so I don't know. There is

5

going to be positive drainage system in

6

that area.

7

MR. GEIGER: Not in that area,

8

we're not going to be putting curbing.

9

MR. MACHTAY: Leave that the way it

10

is.

11

MR. GEIGER: Drain the way it is

12

now.

13

MR. SWANSON: Are you asking to

14

have the EAF modified?

15

MR. MACHTAY: I'm bringing this to

16

his attention. I don't know if it's that

17

critical to change the EAF, but it is on

18

the record as far as the minutes are

19

concerned.

20

MR. GEIGER: If you would like, we

21

could submit a letter indicating that the

22

County will not go beyond the existing

23

sixty-six feet, even though lands beyond

24

are County owned properties.

25

MR. BAGG: They can't go anyway.

1

36

2

MR. MACHTAY: The letter you got on whether there are, you know, endangered or threatened species on the property and so on also says that you should do a more thorough study of the sites.

3

4

5

6

7

I'm bringing this up because, once again, I was sued, the Town was sued, and it was a horrendous experience for everybody concerned.

8

9

10

11

There was said to be all sorts of things about that -- those properties that are unique. Does the present site offer or include scenic views so forth and so on?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I bet you you're saying no. I bet you a nickel if you go into that neighborhood and there has got to be at least one adjoining neighbor, if not more, who will tell you that this is their paradise and it is wonderful and beautiful, and I would have answered that as yes.

24

25

But anyway, having said all that, in my opinion it is on the record in the

1

37

2

minutes. Really no change to the EAF should be necessary unless Jim thinks it's critical.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BAGG: No, at this point in time, I wouldn't think so because they're going to, you know -- their construction will take place within the existing right of way and will not affect any adjacent parklands.

In addition, they can't. They need to access the state legislature to go into parkland and use it for road purposes per se.

MR. MACHTAY: I'm just, you know, bringing it all to your attention.

MR. GROWNEY: I just want to second what you said about farmlands being vistas. I think those are significant vistas. I believe that is a very important factor. I don't even live there but to me open land is --

MR. MACHTAY: They're not farmland anymore.

MS. GROWNEY: They're still open.

1

38

2

MR. BAGG: No, they're coming up
3 with choke cherry trees and reverting back
4 to forests rapidly.

5

MR. GROWNEY: The point is that
6 space, it doesn't have houses.

7

MR. GEIGER: Never will.

8

MS. GROWNEY: That is a significant
9 vista. Doesn't mean you see through it.
10 It means you can look at it somehow.

11

That is something that needs to be
12 always acknowledged.

13

Second thing I would like to bring
14 up has to do with my understanding because
15 I'm trying to understand with this
16 watershed stuff that is going on. If it's
17 always owned by County, this is really --
18 I'm putting this on the floor.

19

I don't understand how it is not
20 going to impact the other adjoining
21 parcels.

22

MR. GEIGER: That's correct. We're
23 going to be precluding run off onto the
24 properties which happens now because you
25 have intermittent curb because some of the

1

39

2

properties are lower than the road itself.

3

Driveways have reverse pitch. By

4

putting driveways in, we're going to keep

5

the water within the right of way, keep it

6

off private properties.

7

MS. GROWNEY: I do support that.

8

MR. PICHNEY: Remember years ago

9

there was major intersection worked on

10

Pulaski and Woodbury. If I'm not

11

mistaken, significant drainage work as

12

well.

13

MR. GEIGER: When we say vicinity,

14

that is the title of that. We're going to

15

be several hundred feet east of that.

16

If you look at where the pavement

17

-- we're going to be starting around

18

Anondale and will not go anywhere near the

19

recent concrete wall, curbing, none of

20

that.

21

MR. GULBRANSEN: The run off topic,

22

you're going to put in sidewalks if you

23

will side. Currently there are no

24

sidewalks there.

25

MR. GEIGER: Right.

2

MR. GULBRANSEN: There would be curbing so -- I couldn't find, I didn't study this well enough. I couldn't find a sense for how much more impervious surfaces are we ending up with?

3

4

5

6

7

You mentioned that the drainage currently sends some of those surface waters off the roads onto adjoining properties. Some people call that swails.

8

9

10

11

I consider that a wonderfully effective way to spread out the load, but you just described it as "let's channel it in."

12

13

14

15

MR. GEIGER: We're adding independent leaching pools along the way where there are none or smaller pools that are outdated, silted up. We're providing leaching pools; four by eight structures up to ten feet deep and we'll put this every five hundred feet or so on both sides of the road.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

We're going to be designing for this increase run off coefficient. The watershed doesn't drain. We're going to

24

25

1

41

2

be collecting more water within the same area. It will incorporate independent structures and upgrade the existing positive systems which are going to the County recharge basins.

3

4

5

6

7

MR. GULBRANSEN: The question would be about installation of all catch basins, an approach which then calls for a lot of maintenance. We heard about vacuum trucks being insufficient number, staff aren't there.

8

9

10

11

12

13

There is another stripe of land that will have more and more maintenance. Was there sufficient consideration not to go for --

14

15

16

17

MR. GEIGER: The way we'll design it is put leaching pools in series and basically in line, so if the road goes from high to low, we may put two or three in a row.

18

19

20

21

22

The first inlet will pick up the great majority of sitting water and everything and be connected, so as the water builds up in the first structure, it

23

24

25

1

42

2

will overload to the second and the hope is that most of the silts and road debris will settle in the first one.

3

4

5

So the maintenance is somewhat easier. You don't have the six months clean out every structure. If you put three four or five, hopefully you can limit your debris into the first inlet structure.

6

7

8

9

10

11

MR. GULBRANSEN: I didn't mean to get into engineering of the structures. I was trying to understand whether the project design considered and decided against the alternate landscaping, changing topography and sending some of the water into vegetated swails as contrasted with --

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

I was hoping that the project manager could answer the question first.

20

21

MR. MACHTAY: In Froehlich Farm, they're not putting curbs and sidewalks, and the swails on the side of the road will serve that purpose to begin with.

22

23

24

25

The only concern that I had there

1

43

2

was any silt or sand or gravel that

3

happens to run into the swails in a really

4

big rain storm ends up down in the ponds.

5

MR. GULBRANSEN: If they're not

6

landscaped properly.

7

MR. MACHTAY: Cold Spring Harbor

8

ponds, there used to be three. Now there

9

is two and the second pond is kind of

10

silted in also now, to some degree.

11

MR. GULBRANSEN: The idea I was

12

trying to understand, whether it was in

13

the scope and decided against was to alter

14

that topography so that it works.

15

You only got what becomes a gulch

16

that does send this silt and kills the

17

trout.

18

I wanted to understand if that was

19

part of what they considered or not.

20

MR. GEIGER: As of right now, no,

21

it is not.

22

The other thing is east of Oakwood,

23

the right of way being forty-nine and a

24

half feet. The total width of what we're

25

going to be doing is forty-nine feet. We

1

44

2

don't want to encroach on private property
3 in those areas.

3

4

Oakwood east, there won't be any
5 swails. It can't be done.

5

6

MR. KAUFMAN: Several questions.

7

Regarding the Froehlich Farm situation and
8 Rich's express fear of basically silt
9 coming off of there, even though the
10 ground seems to be stabilized with
11 regrowth of forest in the area.

10

11

12

Are there provisions in there to
13 maybe catch it at the end of the western
14 terminus of Froehlich Farms?

13

14

15

Are there any plans or mitigation
16 techniques that you can use to prevent
17 basically spoil, if you will, from going
18 down into the ponds?

17

18

19

MR. GEIGER: As of right now, no.

20

Not to say it can't be done.

21

Suffolk County has a system where
22 they develop a series of overflows in a
23 grass area where they catch and treat the
24 run off from the road areas.

22

23

24

25

We did it over by Hashamonack

1

45

2

(phonetic) Pond in Suffolk County where they had an area, maybe an acre wide where the water would come off and go into one settlement area with a berm overflow. By the time anything discharged off site, it was fairly well treated of silts and soils.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MR. KAUFMAN: Lake Ronkonkoma has a similar sidewalk. I would submit to the group based on what -- partly what Rich said and partly on the answer to the question that I just received, it might be a good recommendation to ask that at the western end of the Froehlich Farm swail system as it exists right now, special care be taken to avoid having siltation running down towards the Cold Spring ponds.

20

Is that what you were driving at?

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MACHTAY: Part of the problem is west of Froehlich Farm you have Wicks Farm. That's all County owned property.

To put in any kind of structure -- berm, swail or what have you -- other than

1

46

2

on County road property, which is very

3

narrow over there, you are on the

4

parkland, okay?

5

I don't think anybody wants to see

6

any construction or -- because it is all

7

treed.

8

MR. KAUFMAN: I understand what

9

you're saying, but it would not be a -- I

10

think the proper word is derogation of

11

parkland. We're not alienating it in any

12

way, shape or form, but I'm not familiar

13

with the situation.

14

Based upon what I'm hearing, it

15

might be an intelligent idea to do some

16

work in the area.

17

MR. SWANSON: It is still County,

18

it is parkland. If you can avoid a

19

greater environmental disaster such as

20

filling in of the ponds, the work could be

21

done in that area.

22

MR. MACHTAY: Within the right of

23

way, I don't see there is any problem.

24

MR. GULBRANSEN: Not for you as the

25

engineer there.

1

2

MR. KAUFMAN: It is a
recommendation.

3

4

MR. BAGG: I have a question on
this. Ultimately you're going to put in a
catch basin, but ultimately the end point
is to existing recharge basins.

5

6

7

8

Are those self-contained recharge
basins?

9

10

MR. GEIGER: Yes.

11

12

MR. BAGG: In essence, this stuff
can't end up in the Cold Spring ponds
because it is going to end up in two
existing recharge basins.

13

14

15

MR. GEIGER: There is a high point.
Oakwood Road is a high point. East of
that, everything goes to the two County
recharge basins. West where there is no
curbs, the water will go off the sides.

16

17

18

19

That run off gets to the recharge
basin to the west.

20

21

22

MR. KAUFMAN: In which case I think
we should make a recommendation that
special care be taken to avoid siltation
coming off farms. We're not trying to

23

24

25

1

48

2

engineer it ourselves or say how it should

3

be done. I'm noticing a problem, noticing

4

that it should be handled one way or the

5

other.

6

MR. BAGG: If I might clarify the

7

record, we own the Froehlich Farm. I

8

believe we own the development rights to

9

Wicks Farm.

10

MR. MACHTAY: You own the

11

development rights across the street to

12

where the nursery is. There was a farm,

13

there is a wholesale nursery there now and

14

the County owns the development rights to

15

Wicks Farm.

16

MS. DELISI: County owns that also.

17

MR. BAGG: There is a big recharge

18

basin on that side, too, right? It had a

19

problem that was caused by the farm who

20

created this thing that went running down

21

the other roads.

22

MR. MACHTAY: I think it is across

23

the street is where the recharge basin is

24

and also the County now and town joint

25

jointly own Mars Hill.

1

49

2

MS. SQUIRES: Breezy Park. We are
3 in the process. That is what I was
4 pointing out of developing a large park
5 facility on the corner.

6

It is a shared County-town
7 acquisition, so there would be a huge
8 increase in traffic with people bringing
9 kids there. That is the old nursery. It
10 will be much heavier traffic, as I'm sure
11 you've accounted for in this.

12

That would be good also, the
13 bicycle path because I would assume there
14 would be plenty of kids riding their
15 bicycles to this facility; the bicycle
16 lanes.

17

MR. GEIGER: They're going to be
18 five feet wide.

19

MS. SQUIRES: And very important.

20

MR. MACHTAY: But we also own
21 adjoining the farm are the nurseries that
22 the County owns the development rights to.
23 To the southwest is a piece of property
24 called Mars Hill.

25

It's a blow out, sand blow out next

1

2

to the railroad tracks.

3

MR. BAGG: That is a big swail that runs down there.

4

5

MR. MACHTAY: And the water runs down.

6

7

MS. SQUIRES: It may be a blow out, but it is pretty and nice to hike.

8

9

MR. MACHTAY: And the water runs down from that farm into this. You got to see the topography.

10

11

12

MR. BAGG: The proposal to purchase that was because of that exact problem.

13

14

MR. SWANSON: Did you get what you wanted to say in?

15

16

MS. SQUIRES: I wanted to call attention to the park and the fact there will certainly be a huge amount of increased traffic on that corner, much different to go from a farmland operation to a park with synthetic fields.

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. KAUFMAN: A technical question on construction which has a historical element to it, you're saying the road has two concrete panels as it exists now?

23

24

25

1

2

MR. GEIGER: Correct.

3

4

MR. KAUFMAN: Is that the old style
of construction from the thirties?

5

6

7

8

MR. GEIGER: A lot of them were
designed under WBA authority. It is
consistent on Suffolk County roads out
east, Straight Path, things like that.

9

We've come across that.

10

MR. KAUFMAN: Commack Road also.

11

12

MR. GEIGER: They're actually

twelve feet wide.

13

14

MR. KAUFMAN: These are side by

side.

15

MR. GEIGER: With joint separation.

16

17

MR. KAUFMAN: Again, that looks

like the thirties in terms of time when
you break them up into three inch pieces,
leave them in site and pour oils of some
sort?

18

19

20

21

THE WITNESS: They shatter it,

22

reshape it. Prior to putting asphalt,

23

they put a bonding agent, some kind of oil

24

you mentioned; a mix that would bond.

25

MR. KAUFMAN: You will have a solid

1

52

2

substrata but have movement capability?

3

MR. GEIGER: Yes.

4

MR. PICHNEY: Help me understand

5

the level of technology. I don't know if

6

you made the presentation or Jeff last

7

year with catch basins on Middle Road in

8

Sayville, Bayport.

9

They were using a new technology

10

with those catch basins.

11

MR. GEIGER: No vortex systems.

12

They're required when you have discharge

13

to a surface water. In this case, we

14

don't have that.

15

We're discharging to existing

16

recharge basins. They don't apply.

17

MR. SWANSON: I was going to

18

comment before you make a motion -- I know

19

you're anxious to make one and see your

20

name in print -- it seems like there is

21

lots of discussion, so I think you should

22

think carefully about the motion you're

23

going to make as to either whether we want

24

to put conditions on this or whether we

25

want to table it and have answers to some

1

2

of those questions and have them come
back.

3

4

That is all wanted to say.

5

6

MR. KAUFMAN: Is time of the
essence if we wanted to delay this for a
month to take into consideration --

7

8

9

MR. DAWSON: Jeff Dawson, Suffolk
County Public Works. If I may address the
farm run off issue.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

I'm a senior civil engineer with
Suffolk County DPW. I'm also the County
storm water management officer. I've been
implementing regulations through the DEC's
municipal sewer systems permit that we've
obtained from the DEC.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the requirements of that
permit is that the County has now the
authority through a discharge and
elimination program passed by resolution
in OP 7, we have the authority to issue
notices of violation to any owner of a
adjacent property that has a non-storm
water illicit discharge to our drainage
system.

1

54

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

So in the case of the farm, if that were to still be privately owned, which I know it is not, but as an example, if a farm had run off going down to our property, our roadway, which in DEC's mind and perspective of this permit program, a roadway is occurred a storm sewer system because it is acting as a channel, even if there is not a positive draining system on that.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

That being said, if that farm were discharging run off containing pollutants of concern defined by DEC, and sediments, a very big one siltation which has oxygen reductions because of reduced sunlight infiltration into the water body, the County -- this is what I would do.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would find fine that when identified, when it is brought to our attention of that discharge, we have the authority to issue notices of violation to that property owner saying "you need to stop discharging polluted run off to our roadway," and we have a time frame when

1

55

2

they're allowed to respond by.

3

4

There is a certain protocol we follow as per DEC's general permit requirements.

5

6

7

That being said, in that case obviously the farm is owned by the County.

8

9

You would notice the roadway in that area is elevated from the farm grade and DEC's,

10

11

one of their recommended methods for addressing those kinds of run off

12

situations is a vegetated swail as Mr.

13

Gulbransen was speaking of before.

14

15

That, in my book, if you look at DEC's detail, the swail next to the on the north side, especially of Pulaski Road is a classically designed vegetated swail as per DEC's details.

16

17

18

19

20

So at that point, I believe the run off goes to the west. That swail being

21

22

vegetated has the ability to remove total suspended solids at least to eighty

23

24

percent as well as phosphorous up to

25

eighty percent by vegetative update of that run off.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now that gets through that swail and goes west on Pulaski Road. It is going to come down a drainage system that we did that Mr. Pichney referred to, the Woodbury west project, to Route 108. We did that in 1999,2000. It was construction where we did install a new positive system that has equipped on it catch basins with sumps on them.

It is a two foot sump on the bottom of the basin that allows run off to infiltrate into the ground before it gets to the invert of the pipe.

That is a classic methodology from the wastewater field, just like a septic system. You allow discharge from the top of the tank and sediment stays in the bottom.

MR. DAWSON: Same concept as was implemented in that system. My point is if it were private, we would issue them a notice of violation. We could do that. It is not -- and knowing the situation like I do there, I would still consider

1

57

2

that run off being treated before it does reach the 108.

3

4

I'm not sure where those Nassau Ponds were, but this system discharges to a creek on the northeast corner of 108 and Pulaski Road and then it discharges through that creek up to the north.

5

6

7

8

9

I'm not sure of the water body that it ultimately discharges to.

10

11

My point is the farm owner, you have an issue. I think I can say with a hundred percent certainty, the run off coming from that parcel is no longer contaminated by the time it gets to the 108 creek.

12

13

14

15

16

17

If it were coming onto the County system, the County can't possibly take care of everyone's run off and treat it once it gets to our road. DEC recognized that and allows us to have the authority to prevent situations like that.

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm not a hundred percent sure that I want to accept that application you've given right now. The

24

25

1

58

2

former Huntington Town Planning Director
is sitting at the table here, Mr. Machtay.

3

4

He is saying there is an issue with
run off in the area.

5

6

Is that an accurate statement?

7

MR. MACHTAY: There was an issue.

8

I don't know that there still is an issue.

9

10

As this gentleman just said, there
is a swail there. Vegetation has taken
over the sites which, when it was
farmland, it was bare land, and you always
had the silt and sand and gravel running
off into the road.

11

12

13

14

15

MR. KAUFMAN: That is endemic with
a farm when it is open. When you have the
invasion of choke cherries, it stabilizes.

16

17

18

MR. MACHTAY: It is so thick with
weeds and trees, you can't walk through it
anymore.

19

20

21

MR. KAUFMAN: Given what I'm
hearing, would it kill us or hurt the
project if we were to delay for a month
and verify this information in some way,
shape or form and take a hard look at what

22

23

24

25

1

2

is going on, essentially look at whatever

3

siltation may be coming off of the former

4

farm at this point in time and

5

establishing for us that siltation that

6

maybe in the past used to run off to Cold

7

Spring, that creek you're talking about at

8

the terminus of the Cold Spring

9

compression of ponds down there; would it

10

hurt us to verify that or is that a

11

different creek?

12

MR. MACHTAY: That is the other

13

way.

14

MR. KAUFMAN: Would it hurt us to

15

verify this point? I would ask the

16

engineers if we could wait for a month.

17

MR. DAWSON: To answer your

18

question, no it would not. That is the

19

short answer.

20

Another interesting note to bring

21

to the table is that this project is there

22

SEQRA determination is going to be first

23

step in a series of steps that is part of

24

the federal aid process.

25

This is federally aided. There is

1

60

2

money on the transportation improvement

3

program for 2010 for construction in 2010.

4

We're in the first process of the

5

environmental requirements satisfaction.

6

Once we have this, we can go to the

7

design approval document which is the

8

first step where the state sees the

9

project and starts to review it from an

10

engineering perspective. Everything is

11

going to definitely go through the

12

wringer.

13

To answer your question, we do have

14

time because the process is quite long

15

we're at the relative beginning of this

16

process.

17

MR. SWANSON: Recognizing that

18

process may be long though are we

19

jeopardizing you getting federal funds, if

20

we don't move the project forward today as

21

best we can?

22

MR. DAWSON: Don't think that a

23

month delay would hurt the federal aid

24

process.

25

MR. SWANSON: It seems to me from

1

61

2

what I'm hearing is that probably the only way to satisfy some of our curiosity is to actually have a walk through and I don't know if.

3

4

5

6

MR. GULBRANSEN: If I can add to this notion of checking into it further, particularly when it comes to silt and movement of sediment. MS four hasn't really finally drawn a white line on the amount of water that we're supposed to be trying to catch and handle.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

The engineer did a nice job of pointing out phosphorous and treatments settling, that that happens normally when you have things set up as best you can set up, but there's been -- there is an event that exceeds rain fall, it is going to rip everything like crazy.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

That is what will sit and we'll all look at for a month as it works its way down. I don't want to re-start an evaluation that chases the myth that we could ever counteract that. What we're just trying to do is scope such that the

21

22

23

24

25

1

62

2

design flow is handled with routine stuff,

3

but when it comes to roaring storms and

4

those exceedingly high volume events, I

5

just don't know that the project is going

6

to be improved.

7

Let's be careful about what level

8

of line we're talking about.

9

MR. MACHTAY: Inasmuch as I said

10

before I was personally sued, the Town was

11

sued on this and I've been involved with

12

this area, so to speak, for many, many

13

years, in the final vote, I'm going to

14

have to recuse myself.

15

However, let me say this. I don't

16

think anything is going to change between

17

today and next week. I think we've hacked

18

it all out and talked it all out as Tom

19

says you know, except for some

20

extraordinary event, nothing is going to

21

change.

22

MR. SWANSON: What was your design

23

flow?

24

MR. GEIGER: Two inches.

25

MS. GROWNEY: But seven is the

1

63

2

maximum. Are they going to be changing

3

the regulations?

4

MR. GEIGER: For design of recharge

5

basins it is six inches without with a

6

positive overflow. We're not building a

7

recharge base, but designing independent

8

structures for run off from the street and

9

private properties.

10

We're designing for a two inch

11

storm.

12

MR. KAUFMAN: Larry had taught me

13

through the years that rainfall events on

14

Long Island are increasing in terms of

15

intensity; that the old one inch and two

16

inch requirements that we used to have are

17

being greatly exceeded by the gully washes

18

that we're getting with three four five

19

inch rain storms.

20

Taking into account what Tom has

21

been saying that you can't design for

22

everything and I fully acknowledge that

23

there is no way that you can do a design

24

for, you know, a hurricane drops by, drops

25

eighty inches like happened in Taiwan, you

1

2

can't design for something like that.

3

4

5

6

There is no way I would advocate the two inches, enough a lot of people are going up to three. Maybe if certain specified areas.

7

8

9

10

11

I'm just jumpy about this project in certain areas. It might be an intelligent idea throwing it out to the board in one or two areas if needed, three inch.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. GEIGER: Based on what we're speaking, I think west of Oakwood Road we could adopt our design to a three inch storage and maintain it at two. East of Oakwood, that would not be a significant increase in the cost of the project at all because we have no piping west of Oakwood. We have independent structures. We would be increasing structures by 50 percent.

21

22

23

24

25

Based on a three point five million dollar construction, it is not a significant increase. Your run off coefficient, you have your road and nothing else really. Your watersheds at

1

2

the road pavement which is not a significant amount of areas Anondale.

3

4

Where we start to Oakwood if we have them every five hundred feet, we may be adding another ten or twelve structures which can be a hundred thousand.

5

6

7

8

In the big scope, it's not a great amount of money.

9

10

MR. KAUFMAN: What it boils down to I've driven there. I was not aware of some of the problems until they were brought up here.

11

12

13

14

I'm not trying to drive the project in one way or another. We know that Rich was sued in the past over the issues. We know there have been issues. I'm just trying to be careful to the extent that it has possible impacts upon ponds down at the hatchery and 108 watershed in the area.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That is what I'm trying to defend against, any further environmental degradation.

23

24

25

That is where I'm coming from on

1

66

2

each one of those comments.

3

MR. SWANSON: Are you willing to
4 make a motion?

5

MS. SQUIRES: I want to make some
6 comments for the record. That is to
7 commend the designer for having the
8 bicycle lanes and I think we're talking
9 about federal funding, stress that, and I
10 think all the commendations we have been
11 critical when that has not happened in the
12 past.

13

You know, as you are writing it,
14 point out that the park that will
15 certainly be coming and completed in the
16 next couple of years and the fact that the
17 bicycle traffic will be heavy.

18

MR. KAUFMAN: I've discussed this
19 with the chairman and one or two other
20 members, and my motion is as follows:

21

I think this is an unlisted
22 negative dec. If we put conditions in,
23 that makes it a CND, which we don't like
24 to do recommendations. The way I will
25 phrase this is:

1

67

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The project drainage to the west of the farms be increased to three inches storage capacity to avoid siltation problems further downstream, and that the siltation, possible siltation issues that may once have existed regarding the farms be looked at again and provisions made to assure that that be handled in the best way possible by best management practices.

MR. SWANSON: That is probably the best example of a run on sentence I've ever heard.

Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: I'll second.

MR. SWANSON: Before we take a vote, is that motion as you understood it acceptable?

MR. GEIGER: I believe so.

MR. BAGG: That is going to be a recommendation, just a recommendation. It is not going to be --

MR. SWANSON: Right, okay.

Any further discussion?

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

1

68

2

All in favor?

3

Opposed?

4

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

5

MR. MACHTAY: Recused.

6

MR. SWANSON: One recusal.

7

Thank you for your appearance.

8

I have a question, Rich.

9

When we got these farms, I guess I

10

was sort of under the impression they were

11

going to remain as farms.

12

MS. SQUIRES: They were supposed

13

to.

14

MR. BAGG: They were purchased with

15

quarter percent monies that said they have

16

to remain in natural state and forever

17

wild so, therefore, parks wanted to go in

18

and do maintenance and cut down trees to

19

maintain farmland. They can't do it

20

because it was purchased with quarter

21

percent funds.

22

MS. SQUIRES: It is a very sore

23

point.

24

MR. SWANSON: It was never intended

25

to being an organic farm.

1

69

2

MR. MARTIN: There was discussions
on it.

3

4

MS. SQUIRES: It was intended that
it be farmed. There is a two acre organic
farm.

5

6

7

The people who are running that are
park stewards under the County program and
so there is a small component that is
being run by Friends -- I believe the name
is Friends of Froehlich Farm, we got
caught up in a legal issue where it was
purchased with quarter acre (sic) so that
meant it could not be maintained as a
farm.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. BAGG: That's correct. It
wasn't purchased with farmland development
rights. It was purchased for parks.

17

18

19

MR. MACHTAY: The wholesale nursery
was development rights.

20

21

MR. BAGG: Right.

22

MR. MACHTAY: That is on-going as a
emergency.

23

24

MR. BAGG: We don't own free title
on that. We own rights.

25

1

70

2

MR. MACHTAY: The mover and shaker

3

that -- if you wanted to put it this way

4

-- forced the purchase of the property was

5

the chairperson of the farmland committee.

6

I don't know what it was called, and as

7

Joy says, that was supposed to remain as

8

farm land, and there were a number of

9

farmers that wanted to farm it, but

10

because of the way it was purchased, they

11

couldn't.

12

Once the trees took hold, that was

13

it.

14

MR. SWANSON: Other business?

15

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

16

Joy, when is your fall meeting?

17

MS. SQUIRES: November thirteenth

18

through fifteenth in Watkins Glen. I'll

19

bring you more information next time.

20

MR. SWANSON: Any other CAQ

21

business?

22

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

23

We have a motion?

24

MR. MACHTAY: Motion.

25

MS. RUSSO: Second.

1

2

MR. BAGG: I have a question.

3

Rich, on your vote, did you recuse or

4

abstain?

5

MR. MACHTAY: Recuse.

6

MR. SWANSON: All in favor?

7

(Whereupon, all members responded

8

in the affirmative.)

9

Opposed?

10

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

11

Motion carries.

12

Thank you.

13

(TIME NOTED: 10:45 A.M.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I, DONNA L. SPRATT, a Notary
Public in and for the State of New
York, do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing is a true and
accurate transcript of my
stenographic notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
hereunto set my hand this 30th day
of August 2009.

DONNA L. SPRATT